

REMARKS

The Office Action dated October 5, 2006, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1-3 and 5-10 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 6 is amended. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Zheng during the personal interview held January 9, 2007, are gratefully appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

The Office Action rejects claims 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, the amendment to claim 6 renders claim 6 in conformity with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Moulthrop, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,383,361) in view of Cisar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,635,039) and further in view of Casson (U.S. Patent No. 3,720,164). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, Moulthrop fails to disclose or suggest a water electrolysis system that includes a water electrolysis means, a gas/liquid

separating means, and a backflow means, wherein the gas/liquid separating means is directly connected to a discharge opening through which the gas/liquid mixture of oxygen and pure water is brought out from the water electrolysis means without any intermediate piping, as recited in independent claims 1 and 6. As also agreed during the personal interview, neither Ciser nor Casson, alone or in combination, cure deficiencies in Moulthrop in disclosing or rendering obvious these features.

Furthermore, as agreed during the personal interview, having a water electrolysis system without any intermediate piping allows, for example, to suppress any temperature decrease in the recovered pure water, and suppresses degradation of the purity of the water. Moreover, the claimed water electrolysis system also presents a system configuration that is simplified compared to the systems taught in the applied references.

For at least these reasons, independent claims 1 and 6, and their dependent claims, are patentable over the applied references. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300 referencing **Docket Number 101175-00034**.

Respectfully submitted,



Tarik M. Nabi
Registration No. 55,478

Attachment: Petition for Extension of Time (1 month)

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

TN